

# Memorandum

**TO:** COYOTE VALLEY SPECIFIC PLAN  
TASK FORCE

**FROM:** Darryl Boyd

**SUBJECT:** PLANNING CONSIDERATIONS MATRIX

**DATE:** August 18, 2004

The Coyote Valley Specific Plan (CVSP) Team is pleased to provide the Task Force with the Planning Considerations Matrix, which summarizes the results and recommendations of the technical reports, prepared in the fall and winter of 2003. The technical reports were prepared for the site analysis and background information upon which the alternative CVSP land planning concepts are based. The technical areas included in this matrix are biology, cultural resources, geology, hazardous materials, hydrology, and traffic.

The purpose and intent of this Planning Considerations Matrix, or technical report summary, is to provide the Task Force with a reference for use during the remaining specific plan process. The Site Analysis column provides a summary of the existing environmental conditions for particular technical topics. The Planning Considerations column provides an initial conclusion on the degree to which a particular technical subject may affect the planning process. Recommendations for further review or consideration by the Task Force are also included in the second column.

The Planning Considerations Matrix is intended to be a planning tool and is not an environmental document. The technical reports and this summary matrix are limited to an analysis of the existing environmental conditions for the CVSP project area. It does not include potential environmental impacts and mitigation measures. These will be included in the draft Environmental Impact Report (DEIR), which will be prepared for the specific plan at a later date. We expect to begin DEIR preparation in early fall 2004, after the selection of a project description.

Staff and consultants have been diligent in making this background information as accurate as possible, in order to facilitate the development of the best possible land planning alternatives for consideration by the Task Force. However, it must be stressed that this is preliminary information and data collection and analysis is an on-going task prior to the preparation of the DEIR. This technical information will be revised and updated as necessary for incorporation into the DEIR.

Darryl Boyd, Principal Planner  
Department of Planning, Building and Code Enforcement

Attachment

# COYOTE VALLEY SPECIFIC PLAN PLANNING CONSIDERATIONS

City of San Jose

Based on Technical Reports prepared in 2003, as amended

SITE ANALYSIS	PLANNING CONSIDERATIONS
<i>BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES</i>	
<p style="text-align: center;"><b><u>Special Status Plants</u></b></p> <p>Moderate potential for the Coyote Valley Specific Plan (CVSP) area to support non-listed, special status plant species. Rare plant surveys were conducted for Metcalf Canyon jewelflower, Most beautiful jewelflower, and Santa Clara Valley dudleya.</p> <p>Potential habitat for Santa Clara Valley dudleya and Metcalf Canyon jewelflower within Bailey Avenue-over-the-Hill area, which is included as part of the CVSP project.</p>	<p style="text-align: center;"><b><u>Special Status Plants</u></b></p> <p><b>Planning Issues/Considerations</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>It is not anticipated that the presence of special status plant species will be a significant impediment to the CVSP planning process because special status plant species were not observed within the areas investigated.</li> </ul> <p><b>Recommendations for further review</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Additional plant surveys should be conducted within identified areas of the CVSP area.</li> </ul>
<p style="text-align: center;"><b><u>Special Status Animals</u></b></p> <p><b><i>Birds</i></b></p> <p>Nesting Raptor habitat (which is protected under the Migratory Bird Treaty Act) is available in the riparian habitat, oak woodland, and isolated trees throughout the CVSP area. Many special status songbirds are expected to breed on site. Burrowing Owls have been found within the CVSP area.</p>	<p style="text-align: center;"><b><u>Special Status Animals</u></b></p> <p><b><i>Birds</i></b></p> <p><b>Planning Issues/Considerations</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The presence of raptors and songbirds within the CVSP area is not an impediment to the CVSP planning process with appropriate management techniques.</li> <li>Provision for Burrowing Owl habitat within the CVSP area should be considered to offset the potential impacts to owls or loss of habitat from urban development.</li> <li>Opportunities for mitigation should be considered within the Greenbelt, parks, and open space areas.</li> </ul>

COYOTE VALLEY SPECIFIC PLAN PLANNING CONSIDERATIONS

Based on Technical Reports prepared in 2003, as amended

Page 2 of 29

SITE ANALYSIS	PLANNING CONSIDERATIONS
<p data-bbox="94 678 149 704"><b><i>Bats</i></b></p> <p data-bbox="94 751 753 779">Bats are expected to be present within the CVSP area.</p> <p data-bbox="94 1136 405 1164"><b><i>Reptiles and Amphibians</i></b></p> <p data-bbox="94 1206 1003 1445">The California tiger salamander, California red-legged frog, and western pond turtle all utilize aquatic habitats similar to those found within the CVSP area. Initial data indicates that sala manders breeding in ponds west of the CVSP area are estivating in the hills surrounding the ponds and are not traveling onto the Valley floor. No frogs were identified during protocol level surveys conducted on accessible portions of the CVSP area. Western pond turtles are found within Coyote Creek.</p>	<p data-bbox="1058 367 1545 394"><b>Recommendations for further review</b></p> <ul data-bbox="1121 436 1990 678" style="list-style-type: none"><li data-bbox="1121 436 1990 537">• The California Department of Fish &amp; Game (CDFG) adopted <i>Burrowing Owl Survey Protocol and Mitigation Guidelines</i> recommend breeding season surveys for the entire CVSP area.</li><li data-bbox="1121 545 1990 678">• Pre-construction (protocol level) surveys are recommended prior to development and mitigation measures should be included in the project to avoid or reduce impacts to special status song birds and raptors, including Burrowing Owls.</li></ul> <p data-bbox="1058 686 1115 712"><b><i>Bats</i></b></p> <p data-bbox="1058 756 1461 784"><b>Planning Issues/Considerations</b></p> <ul data-bbox="1104 826 1974 924" style="list-style-type: none"><li data-bbox="1104 826 1974 924">• The presence of bats within the CVSP area is not an impediment to preparing a specific plan for the area with appropriate management techniques.</li></ul> <p data-bbox="1058 969 1545 997"><b>Recommendations for further review</b></p> <ul data-bbox="1104 1039 1990 1104" style="list-style-type: none"><li data-bbox="1104 1039 1990 1104">• Pre-construction bat surveys are recommended for each construction phase of future development.</li></ul> <p data-bbox="1058 1144 1369 1172"><b><i>Reptiles and Amphibians</i></b></p> <p data-bbox="1058 1216 1461 1243"><b>Planning Issues/Considerations</b></p> <ul data-bbox="1104 1286 1984 1351" style="list-style-type: none"><li data-bbox="1104 1286 1984 1351">• On-site opportunities for mitigation should be considered within the Greenbelt, parks, and open space areas.</li></ul>

## COYOTE VALLEY SPECIFIC PLAN PLANNING CONSIDERATIONS

Based on Technical Reports prepared in 2003, as amended

Page 3 of 29

SITE ANALYSIS	PLANNING CONSIDERATIONS
<p data-bbox="94 716 149 740"><b><i>Fish</i></b></p> <p data-bbox="94 786 785 813">Steelhead trout are known to occur within Coyote Creek.</p> <p data-bbox="94 1208 180 1232"><b><i>Insects</i></b></p> <p data-bbox="94 1278 1024 1377">Critical habitat for the bay checkerspot butterfly is found in a small portion of CVSP area. The butterfly's food source (dwarf plantain) was not detected during preliminary surveys on the serpentine outcrop.</p>	<p data-bbox="1058 367 1545 394"><b>Recommendations for further review</b></p> <ul data-bbox="1108 440 1986 643" style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Protocol-level surveys currently underway for California tiger salamander and other listed species should be completed.</li><li>• California tiger salamander surveys are recommended for additional areas within the CVSP area.</li><li>• Continued Red-legged frog and western pond turtle surveys are recommended.</li></ul> <p data-bbox="1058 688 1115 712"><b><i>Fish</i></b></p> <p data-bbox="1058 758 1461 786"><b>Planning Issues/Considerations</b></p> <ul data-bbox="1108 831 1944 963" style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Protection of Coyote Creek, including fishery and stream flows, should be a priority of the CVSP given the importance and sensitivity of this resource to the entire Coyote Valley and larger region.</li></ul> <p data-bbox="1058 1008 1545 1036"><b>Recommendations for further review</b></p> <ul data-bbox="1108 1081 1955 1141" style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Projects that could affect Coyote Creek and steelhead will require permits from the appropriate regulatory agencies.</li></ul> <p data-bbox="1058 1187 1146 1211"><b><i>Insects</i></b></p> <p data-bbox="1058 1256 1461 1284"><b>Planning Issues/Considerations</b></p> <ul data-bbox="1108 1330 1982 1429" style="list-style-type: none"><li>• The critical habitat for the bay checkerspot butterfly should be appropriately considered, but is not considered to be an impediment to the planning process.</li></ul>

## COYOTE VALLEY SPECIFIC PLAN PLANNING CONSIDERATIONS

Based on Technical Reports prepared in 2003, as amended

Page 4 of 29

SITE ANALYSIS	PLANNING CONSIDERATIONS
<p data-bbox="443 365 680 394"><b><u>Sensitive Habitats</u></b></p> <p data-bbox="94 435 1026 673">Potential jurisdictional wetlands have been identified and wetland delineations are currently underway on accessible portions of the CVSP area. These wetland areas include Fisher and Coyote Creeks, which are considered to be sensitive habitats within the CVSP area. The Coyote Creek channel is relatively natural, while some portions of Fisher Creek have been modified and channelized by man for agricultural purposes and to conform to convenient property lines.</p> <p data-bbox="94 751 1003 954">The U.S. Fish &amp; Wildlife Service has indicated concerns regarding the potential for nitrogen deposition from air pollution to affect plant composition in serpentine grasslands and to indirectly impact the bay checkerspot butterfly or its habitat in southern Santa Clara County. This issue was previously raised for other projects, including the Coyote Valley Research Park and Metcalf Energy Center projects.</p>	<p data-bbox="1409 365 1646 394"><b><u>Sensitive Habitats</u></b></p> <p data-bbox="1058 435 1463 464"><b>Planning Issues/Considerations</b></p> <ul data-bbox="1108 505 1990 1393" style="list-style-type: none"><li>• The presence of wetlands and sensitive riparian habitats is considered a significant planning consideration during the CVSP planning process. An individual U.S. Army Corps of Engineers permit will be required for any filling of Section 404 jurisdictional wetlands and waters. In addition, a Section 401 water quality certification (Regional Water Quality Control Board) and a Section 1602 Streambed Alteration Permit (CDFG) will be required for impacts to riparian areas.</li><li>• Opportunities for the creation of compensatory mitigation habitats within the CVSP area should be considered in the planning process.</li><li>• Development setbacks from creeks consistent with the City of San Jose's Riparian Corridor Policy Study will be incorporated in the planning process.</li><li>• "Guiding Principles" for dealing with sensitive habitats, including wildlife corridors, should be developed in the planning process.</li><li>• Opportunities to incorporate mitigation within the Greenbelt, parks, and open space areas should be considered in the planning process.</li><li>• Consideration should be given to the reconstruction of Fisher Creek in a way that maximizes habitat, drainage, and open space benefits.</li><li>• Consideration should be given to a land plan that reduces Vehicle Miles Traveled (VMT) and Vehicle Hours Traveled (VHT) as much as possible to reduce pollution emissions.</li><li>• The issue of nitrogen deposition on serpentine habitats (indirect impact) will require additional analysis and consideration during the planning and environmental review processes.</li></ul>

COYOTE VALLEY SPECIFIC PLAN PLANNING CONSIDERATIONS

Based on Technical Reports prepared in 2003, as amended

Page 5 of 29

SITE ANALYSIS	PLANNING CONSIDERATIONS
<i>CULTURAL RESOURCES</i>	
<p align="center"><b><u>Prehistoric Resources</u></b></p> <p>A total of 35 prehistoric archaeological sites have been recorded within the CVSP area. There are also three reported, but unrecorded sites and one isolated prehistoric find. Four of the prehistoric sites have been evaluated and found to be eligible for inclusion on the National or California Registers, and two of the sites have been determined to be eligible as part of a district. The remaining 29 prehistoric sites have not been evaluated. Native American resources include a former major village site noted by early Spanish explorers, and other habitation locations including temporary camps, workshops, burial locations, and a trail. Site locations appear to favor benches, terraces and ridges along canyons, water courses, marsh margins, and the alluvial plain.</p> <p><b><i>Trails</i></b></p> <p>One major aboriginal trail passed through the Coyote Valley near Coyote Creek. This north/south trail appears to have been the precursor of the El Camino Real. Secondary trails are also inferred within the area.</p>	<p align="center"><b><u>Prehistoric Sites</u></b></p> <p><b>Planning Issues/Considerations</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Opportunities for prehistoric resource protection, including open space and other easements to conserve and preserve these resources should be evaluated during the planning process.</li> <li>• Opportunities for preservation/avoidance should be evaluated in the planning process.</li> </ul> <p><b>Recommendations for further review</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Additional surveys are recommended to determine if any of the unevaluated sites are eligible for either the National or California Register.</li> <li>• Development could result in the discovery of valuable scientific information and add significantly to the interpretation and understanding of the region's prehistory.</li> </ul>
<p align="center"><b><u>Historic Resources</u></b></p> <p>Historic Period sites include resources from the American Period (post-1850) and consist mainly of structures. Relatively few structures survive the period with integrity. Eight architectural resources have been identified within the CVSP area. One resource has been determined to be eligible for the National/California Registers, one resource is potentially eligible, portions of two resources are potentially eligible, one resource has been evaluated as a potential district, and one resource has been evaluated as an Identified Structure on a local list.</p>	<p align="center"><b><u>Historic Resources</u></b></p> <p><b>Planning Issues/Considerations</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Opportunities for preservation and avoidance of significant historic resources should be a key consideration in the planning process.</li> <li>• Opportunities for adaptive reuse and/or salvage of historic buildings should be evaluated in the planning process.</li> </ul>

## COYOTE VALLEY SPECIFIC PLAN PLANNING CONSIDERATIONS

Based on Technical Reports prepared in 2003, as amended

Page 6 of 29

SITE ANALYSIS	PLANNING CONSIDERATIONS
<p>The remaining resources have been determined ineligible for inclusion on the register. All of the listed resources are centered on the Hamlet of Coyote, which could qualify as a historic district. Twelve other architectural resources were identified during a preliminary windshield survey as being potentially eligible for the Register, with further research required.</p> <p><b><i>Expedition Routes</i></b></p> <p>The Captain Pedro Fages Trail (1772) and the Juan Bautista de Anza National Historic Trail (1776) both traveled through the Coyote Valley. These trails are on the National/California Registers of Historic Resources.</p> <p><b><i>Roads and Railroad</i></b></p> <p>El Camino Real extended from <i>Mission San Diego de Alcala</i> to the <i>Pueblo of San Jose</i>, through <i>Rancho La Laguna Seca</i> (Coyote Valley), passing on the west side of Tulare Hill. The road is State of California Historic Landmark #784 and is on the California Register of Historic Resources. Monterey Road was a toll road between San Jose and Gilroy/Watsonville (1850s). Portions were relocated in the 1860s parallel to the railroad and it was declared a public highway in 1874. The Santa Clara &amp; Pajaro Valley (SC&amp;PV) Railroad ran through the Coyote Valley area, stopping at Coyote Station and the Fifteen Mile House in 1869. The SC&amp;PV RR was consolidated into the Southern Pacific Railroad in 1870, and is currently operating as the Union Pacific Railroad (UPRR).</p> <p><b><i>Irrigation/Water Systems</i></b></p> <p>The “great Laguna Seca” in northern Coyote Valley was the source for irrigation canals and impounding dams. The configuration of portions of Laguna Seca Creek (Fisher Creek) shows evidence of modification.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Adherence to the requirements of the City’s Historic Preservation policies and ordinance should be incorporated into the planning process.</li><li>• Opportunities for identifying relocation sites for significant historic building resources should be considered in the planning process.</li></ul> <p><b>Recommendations for further review</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Additional surveys are recommended to determine the significance of all of the unevaluated sites or structures and if they are eligible for listing on the National or California Registers.</li><li>• Development could result in the discovery of valuable scientific information and add significantly to the interpretation and understanding of the region’s history.</li></ul>

COYOTE VALLEY SPECIFIC PLAN PLANNING CONSIDERATIONS

Based on Technical Reports prepared in 2003, as amended

Page 7 of 29

SITE ANALYSIS	PLANNING CONSIDERATIONS
<p><b><i>Arboricultural Resources</i></b></p> <p>Several arboricultural resources have been identified to date within the CVSP area. These resources include the IBM walnut farm, a grove of eucalyptus trees, a grove of oak trees, a row of trees leading to a ranch, eucalyptus trees in the Hamlet of Coyote, and the “Keesling’s Shade Trees” on Monterey Road.</p>	<p><b><i>Arboricultural Resources</i></b></p> <p><b>Planning Issues/Considerations</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The arboricultural resources, including significant individual oak trees, are an important component of the Valley’s history. They should be considered a priority to preserve, protect and incorporate into the CVSP.</li> <li>• Policies for protection of other native, ordinance size trees should be developed during the planning process.</li> </ul> <p><b>Recommendations for further review</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Additional surveys are recommended to determine if any of the unevaluated resources are eligible for either the National or California Register or the City’s Heritage Tree designation.</li> </ul>
<p><b><u>Cultural Landscapes</u></b></p> <p>A landscape is comprised of all the natural and cultural features that the eye can comprehend in a single view. A preliminary review was conducted to get a better understanding of the agricultural-related history of Coyote Valley and the types of historic architectural features that remain. The CVSP area still remains rural in character and the majority of the land use continues to be related to agriculture even though the area’s association with fruit orchards no longer exists. While there have been additions of roads, houses, and small businesses, these additions have not yet eliminated the area’s setting, character, or feeling related to agriculture. The preliminary review is not conclusive or certain that sufficient integrity remains for the area to be considered eligible as a historic cultural landscape district under the National/California Register criteria.</p>	<p><b><u>Cultural Landscapes</u></b></p> <p><b>Planning Issues/Considerations</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The rich agricultural history and rural landscape should be considered as an important element in the CVSP process.</li> </ul> <p><b>Recommendations for further review</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Additional evaluation is recommended to assess the integrity of Coyote Valley as a cultural landscape historic district and determine if the CVSP area qualifies for listing on either the National or California Register.</li> </ul>



COYOTE VALLEY SPECIFIC PLAN PLANNING CONSIDERATIONS

Based on Technical Reports prepared in 2003, as amended

Page 8 of 29

SITE ANALYSIS	PLANNING CONSIDERATIONS
<i><b>GEOLOGY AND SOILS</b></i>	
<p data-bbox="390 443 730 472" style="text-align: center;"><u><b>Potential Seismic Hazards</b></u></p> <p data-bbox="92 509 201 539"><i><b>Faulting</b></i></p> <p data-bbox="92 579 1026 748">There are two faults that require further evaluation to determine whether they are active, the Shannon and Coyote Faults. The City of San Jose generally requires that if indications of active faulting are found, appropriate setbacks for structures or recommendations for special foundation considerations be established as applicable.</p> <p data-bbox="92 1175 338 1205"><i><b>Undocumented Fill</b></i></p> <p data-bbox="92 1245 756 1274">Undocumented fills are located within the CVSP area.</p>	<p data-bbox="1352 443 1692 472" style="text-align: center;"><u><b>Potential Seismic Hazards</b></u></p> <p data-bbox="1056 509 1165 539"><i><b>Faulting</b></i></p> <p data-bbox="1056 579 1461 609"><b>Planning Issues/Considerations</b></p> <ul data-bbox="1104 654 1982 966" style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• As for all sites within the San Francisco Bay Area, the likelihood of at least one moderate to strong earthquake occurring during the life span of the development being planned for the CVSP area is considered high.</li> <li>• If active faulting is present in the CVSP area, appropriate setbacks for structures or recommendations for special foundation considerations may be recommended. If setbacks were recommended, this would be a major planning consideration for the preparation of the CVSP.</li> </ul> <p data-bbox="1056 1008 1545 1037"><b>Recommendations for further review</b></p> <ul data-bbox="1104 1081 1961 1141" style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Complete investigation to determine if active faulting is present in the CVSP area.</li> </ul> <p data-bbox="1056 1183 1302 1213"><i><b>Undocumented Fill</b></i></p> <p data-bbox="1056 1255 1461 1284"><b>Planning Issues/Considerations</b></p> <ul data-bbox="1104 1328 1965 1425" style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Existing undocumented fills may need to be removed and replaced with engineered fill. This is not a significant impediment to the CVSP planning process.</li> </ul>

COYOTE VALLEY SPECIFIC PLAN PLANNING CONSIDERATIONS

Based on Technical Reports prepared in 2003, as amended

Page 9 of 29

SITE ANALYSIS	PLANNING CONSIDERATIONS
<p><b><i>Seismically-Induced Liquefaction</i></b></p> <p>Seismically induced liquefaction is a phenomenon of the CVSP area, as well as the entire Bay Area. Liquefaction results in the transformation of loose water-saturated soils from a solid state during groundshaking. Many elements influence the potential for liquefaction including the soil type, soil cohesion, and groundwater level. According to the Association of Bay Area Governments (ABAG), liquefaction potential within the CVSP area varies from low to very high. Areas of very high susceptibility are found in the Greenbelt area of the CVSP area, adjacent to Coyote Creek.</p> <p><b><i>Seismically-Induced Landsliding and Lateral Spreading</i></b></p> <p>The risk of slope instability is greater during major earthquakes than during other time periods. Mapping of the hillside areas in the northwestern portion of the North Coyote Valley area indicates that most of the hillside areas may be susceptible to seismically-induced landsliding and lateral spreading.</p>	<p><b><i>Seismically-Induced Liquefaction</i></b></p> <p><b>Planning Issues/Considerations</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>A wide range of standard construction measures is employed throughout the Bay Area. Implementing standard measures to mitigate potential liquefaction hazards, such as soil densification or deep foundation systems, is not an impediment to the CVSP planning process.</li> </ul> <p><b><i>Seismically-Induced Landsliding and Lateral Spreading</i></b></p> <p><b>Planning Issue/Considerations</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>This is not a significant impediment to the CVSP planning process and can be addressed with corrective grading or by establishing appropriate setbacks, the risks associated with landsliding during a seismic event can generally be reduced to acceptable levels.</li> </ul>
<p><b><u>Potential Landslide Hazards</u></b></p> <p>Landslide areas are located in the northwestern portion of the North Coyote Valley area and the risk of instability of these areas is considered high.</p>	<p><b><u>Potential Landslide Hazards</u></b></p> <p><b>Planning Issues/Considerations</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>When appropriate, setbacks of between 50 and 100 feet from the top and toe of the landslide areas, depending upon the size and type of landslide and the nature of the development that is planned, should be integrated into the planning process.</li> </ul>

COYOTE VALLEY SPECIFIC PLAN PLANNING CONSIDERATIONS

Based on Technical Reports prepared in 2003, as amended

Page 10 of 29

<p style="text-align: center;"><b><u>Expansive Soils</u></b></p> <p>Moderately expansive soils are located within the CVSP area.</p>	<p style="text-align: center;"><b><u>Expansive Soils</u></b></p> <p><b>Planning Issues/Considerations</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• This is not a significant impediment to the CVSP planning process and can be addressed by deepening the building foundations or by providing a layer of material with low expansion potential to reduce the effects of the expansive soils on foundations.</li></ul>
<p style="text-align: center;"><b><u>Creek Bank Erosion</u></b></p> <p>The banks of both Coyote and Fisher Creeks have not experienced rapid erosion, as evidenced by their heavily vegetated conditions. The rates of creek erosion, can however, be affected by development in or adjacent to the Plan area.</p>	<p style="text-align: center;"><b><u>Creek Bank Erosion</u></b></p> <p><b>Planning Issues/Considerations</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• The CVSP planning process should be consistent with the City of San Jose's Riparian Corridor Policy, which generally requires a 100-foot setback from the top of bank or canopy edge, whichever is greater, to reduce the potential impacts associated with creekbank erosion.</li></ul>

<b><i>HAZARDOUS MATERIALS</i></b>	
<p align="center"><b><u>Hazardous Materials Contamination</u></b></p> <p>Given the number of acres of land within the CVSP area, there are relatively few locations of suspected or actual hazardous materials contamination. The presence of underground or above ground tanks on properties within these areas is not indicative of contamination. Further, while contamination cases within the Plan area have been closed by the regulatory agencies, there is a potential for residual contaminants to remain in the soil or groundwater at the site. Unreported releases are also likely within the CVSP area.</p>	<p align="center"><b><u>Hazardous Materials Contamination</u></b></p> <p><b>Planning Consideration/Issues</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• This is not a significant impediment to the CVSP planning process due to the limited occurrences, which can be addressed by standard remediation techniques.</li> </ul> <p><b>Recommendations for further review</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Prior to development of areas where contamination may be present, soil and/or groundwater testing is recommended to determine the extent of the contamination. Depending upon the extent and characterization of the spill/leak, impacted soil should be either be remediated on-site or removed and disposed of at appropriate facilities. Impacted groundwater should be similarly treated in accordance with all local, state, and federal regulations.</li> </ul>
<p align="center"><b><u>Railroad Tracks</u></b></p> <p>The UPRR tracks extend from the southeast to the northeast through the Coyote Valley. Railroad right-of-ways have the potential for hazardous materials contamination because railroad cars may leak when they are parked on the tracks. In addition, assorted chemicals historically have been used for dust suppression and weed control along rail lines. For these reasons, impacted soil along the railroad tracks may be present within the CVSP area.</p>	<p align="center"><b><u>Railroad Tracks</u></b></p> <p><b>Planning Consideration/Issues</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The presence of the railroad tracks is an important consideration, but is not a significant impediment to the CVSP planning process.</li> </ul>

COYOTE VALLEY SPECIFIC PLAN PLANNING CONSIDERATIONS

Based on Technical Reports prepared in 2003, as amended

Page 12 of 29

	<p><b>Recommendations for further review</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Prior to development of areas adjacent to railroad tracks, soil testing is recommended to determine the extent of the contamination. Depending upon the extent and characterization of the contamination, impacted soil should be either be remediated on-site or removed and disposed of at appropriate facilities in accordance with all local, state, and federal regulations.</li></ul>
<p><b><u>Lead</u></b></p> <p>Lead could occur within the CVSP area by way of the use of lead-based paints and lead containing pesticides and the production of automobile exhaust. The use of pesticides containing lead is discussed in the Agricultural Uses section, below. Prior to 1978, structures and fences were commonly painted with lead-based paints. Lead is often present in near-surface soil along heavily traveled roadways, such as Monterey Road and Santa Teresa Boulevard, due to the use of leaded gasoline for several decades.</p>	<p><b><u>Lead</u></b></p> <p><b>Planning Consideration/Issues</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• This is not a significant impediment to the CVSP planning process and can be addressed with standard remediation techniques.</li></ul> <p><b>Recommendations for further review</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• It is recommended that soil quality along these roadways be evaluated prior to development.</li><li>• It is recommended that the demolition of older structures be conducted according to the requirements of the Cal/OSHA Lead in Construction Standard, Title 8, California Code of Regulations. If lead-based paint is peeling, flaking, or blistered, it should be removed prior to demolition.</li></ul>
<p><b><u>Asbestos</u></b></p> <p>Asbestos -Containing Materials (ACMs) may be present in older buildings within the CVSP area. Asbestos is a naturally occurring mineral that is used in the production of certain types of building materials including roofing shingles, ceiling and floor tiles, etc. Exposure to asbestos can occur by breathing contaminated air, which can be generated during the demolition of structures with ACMs. Asbestos exposure is a health hazard.</p>	<p><b><u>Asbestos</u></b></p> <p><b>Planning Consideration/Issues</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• This is not a significant impediment to the CVSP planning process and can be addressed with standard remediation techniques.</li></ul>

COYOTE VALLEY SPECIFIC PLAN PLANNING CONSIDERATIONS

Based on Technical Reports prepared in 2003, as amended

Page 13 of 29

	<p><b>Recommendations for further review</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• If demolition or renovation of existing structures is proposed, surveys should be conducted to determine the presence of ACMs according to the National Emissions Standards for Hazardous Air Pollutants guidelines. If ACMs are encountered, they should be removed according to all applicable local, state, and federal regulations.</li></ul>
<p><b><u>Undocumented Fill</u></b></p> <p>Stockpiles of undocumented fill associated with farming operations were observed throughout the Valley. Fill is also being imported to the Coyote Creek Golf Course to create landscaped mounds at the golf course.</p>	<p><b><u>Undocumented Fill</u></b></p> <p><b>Planning Consideration/Issues</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• This is not a significant impediment to the CVSP planning process and can be addressed with standard soil engineering techniques.</li></ul> <p><b>Recommendations for further review</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Prior to development of areas where fill is present, the origin of the fill should be evaluated to assess whether it is impacted with contaminants. Depending upon the extent and characterization of the fill material, impacted soil could be either be remediated on-site or removed and disposed of at appropriate facilities.</li></ul>
<p><b><u>Agricultural Uses</u></b></p> <p>While most of the contamination from leaking storage tanks can be attributable to agricultural uses within the Valley, the use of fertilizers, pesticides, and herbicides for agricultural uses is also likely. Pesticides that persist in the environment and that have been banned for use, such as DDT, were likely used throughout the Valley. These pesticides were commonly applied in mixtures that also contained metals (arsenic, lead, and mercury).</p>	<p><b><u>Agricultural Uses</u></b></p> <p><b>Planning Consideration/Issues</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• This is not a significant impediment to the CVSP planning process and can be addressed with standard remediation techniques.</li></ul>

COYOTE VALLEY SPECIFIC PLAN PLANNING CONSIDERATIONS

Based on Technical Reports prepared in 2003, as amended

Page 14 of 29

	<p><b>Recommendations for further review</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• An assessment of soil quality in the Coyote Valley should be performed prior to development to identify areas of excessive concentrations of herbicides, pesticides, and associated metals.</li><li>• Appropriate best management practices and techniques for sustainable agriculture uses in the Greenbelt should be considered.</li></ul>
<p><b><u>Water Supply Wells</u></b></p> <p>Numerous water wells are located within the Valley.</p>	<p><b><u>Water Supply Wells</u></b></p> <p><b>Planning Consideration/Issues</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• This is not a significant impediment to the CVSP planning process and can be addressed with standard management techniques.</li></ul> <p><b>Recommendations for further review</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Ensure that wells are properly abandoned in accordance with applicable regulations if continued use is no longer intended.</li><li>• Ensure water supply is available in the Greenbelt for sustainable agriculture uses.</li></ul>

<b><i>HYDROLOGY</i></b>	
<p><b><u>Groundwater Management And Water Supply</u></b></p> <p>Development within the CVSP area will require an adequate supply of high quality water for domestic, commercial, and industrial use, as well as continued agricultural demand in the Greenbelt. Estimates of water demand within the CVSP area are based on a desired maximum number of jobs and housing units, coupled with a range of demand factors including typical applied irrigation demand values. A realistic average ultimate water demand in the CVSP area is on the order of 18,000 acre-feet per year (for comparison purposes, the City of San Jose uses approximately 230,000 acre-feet of water per year).</p> <p>Doubling the volume of water extracted from the Sub-basin every year to meet the increased water demands expected from the development of the CVSP area, will reduce the amount of water stored in the basin and lower the water table. Therefore, recharge to the Sub-basin commensurate with the amount of water extracted will be required, since the Subbasin can only provide for two or three years of increased demand after ultimate development. Water operations in Coyote Valley require a balancing act to avoid high groundwater nuisance conditions, while maintaining the groundwater sub-basin flows to the Santa Clara Valley Sub-basin to the north.</p>	<p><b><u>Groundwater Management And Water Supply</u></b></p> <p><b>Planning Consideration/Issues</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Groundwater management and water supply is considered to be a significant consideration during the CVSP planning process.</li> <li>• Ongoing water resource management programs must be incorporated into the planning process.</li> <li>• The Santa Clara Valley Water District's (SCVWD) groundwater management programs for the Valley can be divided into three main categories: groundwater recharge, regional water supplies, and water use efficiency. The overall goals of the management programs are: sustaining groundwater supplies, mitigation of groundwater overdraft, minimization of land subsidence, protection recharge and pumping capabilities, and sustaining water storage reserves for dry period use. Consideration of these management programs should be included in the planning process.</li> </ul> <p><b>Recommendations for further review</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The analysis required as part of SB610 has been commissioned and is under preparation.</li> </ul>



	<p><b><i>Groundwater Recharge</i></b></p> <p><b>Planning Issues/Considerations</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Areas with significant recharge capabilities should be protected during the planning process.</li></ul> <p><b>Recommendations for further review</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• The SCVWD has the ability to facilitate enhanced groundwater recharge. Based on available information, there is no reason to believe that there is a physical limitation to recharging an additional 6,000 to 14,000 acre-feet per year through the gravel bed of Coyote Creek into the Coyote Subbasin, and from the water bearing strata to deliver that water to municipal wells without severe drawdown. Detailed groundwater modeling is recommended to confirm this hypothesis. It should be noted that 14,000 acre-feet represents about 13 percent of the total capacity of Anderson and Coyote Reservoirs.</li></ul> <p><b><i>Regional Water Supplies</i></b></p> <p><b>Planning Issues/Considerations</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Reliable water supply source(s) is a significant consideration for the planning process.</li><li>• Imported water could be used to actively manage the recharge of the Coyote Subbasin; however, the impacts of doing so are regional in nature rather than local. This issue should be evaluated in the planning process.</li></ul>
--	--

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>Adapting key regional and local facilities (particularly the Coyote Canal), to manage groundwater resources within the Subbasin can help to overcome water supply constraints. This issue should be evaluated in the planning process.</li></ul> <p><b><i>Water Use Efficiency</i></b></p> <p><b><u>Recycled Water Use</u></b></p> <p><b>Planning Issues/Considerations</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>The South Bay Water Recycling Program (SBWRP) has completed an extension of its recycled water system as far south as Blanchard Road to provide recycled water to the Metcalf Energy Center; however, there are currently no plans to extend the system to the rest of Coyote Valley.</li><li>Current development policy within San Jose calls for projects to include provisions for recycled water use, should the SBWRP distribution system eventually be routed to a particular location. Providing an opportunity for future recycled water use includes construction of dual water systems and the use of more drought and salt tolerant landscaping.</li><li>Providing recycled water for landscaping and open space irrigation use should be evaluated in the planning process.</li></ul>
--	---

COYOTE VALLEY SPECIFIC PLAN PLANNING CONSIDERATIONS

Based on Technical Reports prepared in 2003, as amended

Page 18 of 29

	<p><b><u>Water Conservation Programs</u></b></p> <p><b>Planning Issues/Considerations</b></p> <p>This is not an impediment to preparing the CVSP. Best management practices for water conservation should be included in the planning process.</p>
<p><b><u>Floodplain Management</u></b></p> <p>Development in or near a natural floodplain has the potential to change that floodplain and affect flooding further downstream. The conversion of rural watersheds to more urban land uses tends to increase the percentage of impermeable ground cover, with commensurate increases in maximum watershed discharge rates and volumes.</p> <p>Flood control improvements have been developed for the North Coyote Valley area, which has been approved for the development of 6.6 million square feet of campus industrial uses. These improvements include a 269-acre flood control basin (Laguna Seca), Fisher Creek improvements, a new bypass channel, and levee improvements.</p> <p>Floodplain mitigation in North Coyote Valley assumes that runoff generated south of Bailey Avenue does not exceed existing condition discharge. The proposed development of the Mid-Coyote Valley area assumes that 75 percent of the area would be covered with impervious surfaces. Therefore, it is estimated that development of the Mid-Coyote area would approximately require an additional 600 acre-feet of floodplain storage for Fisher Creek.</p>	<p><b><u>Floodplain Management</u></b></p> <p><b>Planning Issues/Considerations</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• This is a significant consideration for the CVSP planning process.</li><li>• A floodplain storage facility (or facilities) similar to that planned within the North Coyote Valley area would be required. With average storage depths on the order of five feet, approximately 80 additional acres must be placed into Fisher Creek floodplain storage and existing floodplain storage must be maintained (505 acres).</li><li>• Possible development along Coyote Creek would have a negligible impact on that creek's discharge and volume.</li></ul>

## COYOTE VALLEY SPECIFIC PLAN PLANNING CONSIDERATIONS

Based on Technical Reports prepared in 2003, as amended

Page 19 of 29

### Water Quality

Water quality can be considered both in terms of groundwater and surface water quality. Nitrates are the contaminants of primary concern within the Coyote Valley. Perchlorate contamination has not been identified for the CVSP area; however, it has been detected in the adjacent Llagas Subbasin. Its migration is being actively monitored by the SCVWD.

The City of San Jose is a co-permittee in the Santa Clara Valley Urban Runoff Pollution Prevention Program (SCVURPP), meaning that it shares an individual National Pollutant Discharge Elimination (NPDES) permit for discharging to the San Francisco Bay with other members of the SCVURPPP. Since the CVSP area lies entirely within the watershed of the Bay, it will fall under the auspices of SCVURPPP. Groundwater quality within the Valley is generally considered to be good.

In October 2001, the Regional Water Quality Control Board changed the requirements for stormwater quality related to new development and redevelopment (C.3. Provisions). Overall, the requirements of the C.3. Provisions are to implement water quality treatment and to ensure that flows and duration of stormwater runoff do not increase as a result of new development or redevelopment.

### Water Quality

#### **Planning Issues/Considerations**

- Groundwater quality is an important consideration, but not an impediment to the CVSP planning process. In the event that nitrate concentrations over the limit of drinking water standards are found, it is possible to treat and remove it from the groundwater supply.
- Surface water quality is a significant consideration for the CVSP planning process. Best management practices, including the storage of stormwater prior to outfall to a creek, would be implemented within the CVSP area. These BMPs must be sized according to either volume or flow design. By applying the volume design methodology, it has been estimated that development of the CVSP area would require a storage volume equivalent to about 0.02 acre-foot for every acre of development. Some dual uses may be possible with the creation of floodplain storage areas.

## COYOTE VALLEY SPECIFIC PLAN PLANNING CONSIDERATIONS

Based on Technical Reports prepared in 2003, as amended

Page 20 of 29

### ***TRANSPORTATION***

#### **Internal Travel Demand**

Preliminary traffic modeling shows a relatively strong demand for roadway capacity within the CVSP area. Three major arterial streets will provide access within the CVSP area: 1) Santa Teresa Boulevard, 2) Coyote Valley Parkway, and 3) Monterey Road.

Additional right-of-way will likely be needed from adjacent parcels for the widening of Santa Teresa Boulevard to six lanes south of Bailey Avenue. It is anticipated that the roadway will be improved following the same general alignment. Coyote Valley Parkway is planned as previously described. There are physical constraints at the north end of the valley (Coyote Creek Narrows) that would significantly affect the cost of widening Monterey Road.

#### ***Trails and Bike Lanes***

The Coyote Creek Trail runs through the entire Coyote Valley along Coyote Creek. Additional trails are identified on the Santa Clara County Trails Master Plan and the City of San Jose's Scenic Routes and Trails Map. There are currently no bike lanes along roadways within the CVSP area.

#### **Internal Travel Demand**

##### **Planning Issues/Considerations**

- The planning process should develop internal roadway capacity without introducing new intersections along Bailey Avenue east of Santa Teresa. This is because Bailey Avenue provides a key linkage between the CVSP area and the U.S. 101 freeway. The projected traffic volumes along Bailey Avenue are very high and it will be very important to minimize side street traffic volumes in order to maintain an acceptable level of service for commuters using Bailey Avenue. Because of the parallel Union Pacific railroad tracks, any additional right-of-way will need to be taken from the east side of the road where Coyote Creek is located. The widening of these streets should be taken into consideration during the preparation of the CVSP.
- Alternative plans that offset peak directional traffic flows and internalize trips, such as mixing housing and jobs throughout the North and Mid-Coyote Valley areas and avoiding locating all jobs in one area and all housing in another area, should be evaluated in the planning process.

#### ***Trails and Bike Lanes***

##### **Planning Issues/Considerations**

- Integrated bike/pedestrian/alternatives to automobile transportation should be evaluated as a key component to the CVSP.

## COYOTE VALLEY SPECIFIC PLAN PLANNING CONSIDERATIONS

Based on Technical Reports prepared in 2003, as amended

Page 21 of 29

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>Continued access to the Coyote Creek Trail from the CVSP area should be evaluated and opportunities for additional trails within the CVSP, including along Fisher Creek should be examined. Bike lanes should be considered along Santa Teresa Boulevard and some connector streets.</li></ul>
<p><b><u>Travel Demand Between CVSP Area and US 101 Freeway and McKean Road</u></b></p> <p>Principles of traffic modeling indicate there will be a strong demand between the CVSP area and the U.S. 101 freeway. This is because US 101 provides the best route to jobs located north and south of Coyote Valley.</p> <p>The San Jose General Plan shows a southward extension of Coyote Valley Parkway, interchanging with Monterey Road, overcrossing Coyote Creek and connecting to the existing interchange at U.S. 101. It appears that this is still a very desirable major street route. The route may involve a mixture of existing and new public right-of-way, and no specific alignment has been selected.</p> <p>The San Jose General Plan provides for Bailey Avenue to be improved as a Major Arterial connection between Coyote Valley and McKean Road, northerly to Harry Road. Bailey Avenue is shown in two alternative alignments between Santa Teresa Boulevard and McKean Road. The need for an improved connection is attributable to the commuting needs of an expected workforce of approximately 50,000 industrial jobs within the CVSP. Bailey/McKean is designated as a Rural Scenic Corridor on the General Plan Scenic Routes and Trails Diagram.</p>	<p><b><u>Travel Demand Between CVSP Area and US 101 Freeway and McKean Road</u></b></p> <p><b>Planning Issues/Considerations</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>The interchanges at Coyote Creek Golf Course Drive (formerly named Scheller Avenue) is included in the San Jose 2020 General Plan Land Use Transportation Diagram and may provide the most advantageous way to provide a linkage between Central Coyote Valley and the freeway. This connection will require a grade-separated interchange at Monterey Road and a bridge over Coyote Creek.</li></ul> <p><b>Recommendations for further review</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>Previous planning studies have shown that the Bailey Avenue improvements will be “triggered” once there are about 22,000 industrial jobs within the specific plan area. The future housing in the CVSP area may not create a significant demand for “Bailey Avenue over the Hill” for two reasons. First, there are no significant employment centers within Almaden Valley and second, it would be a long and slow route to the jobs located in northern Santa Clara County, when compared to Highway 101. These assumptions should be verified by preliminary traffic analysis for consideration in the planning process.</li></ul>

COYOTE VALLEY SPECIFIC PLAN PLANNING CONSIDERATIONS

Based on Technical Reports prepared in 2003, as amended

Page 22 of 29

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>The preferred roadway alignment for the Bailey Avenue over the hill extension should be determined based on substantial scientific environmental information. Minimizing environmental impacts should be a primary consideration.</li></ul>
<p><b><u>Safely accommodating Travel Demand across the Union Pacific Railroad Tracks</u></b></p> <p>Due to safety hazards, the general objective should be to eliminate all at-grade railroad crossings through the CVSP area.</p>	<p><b><u>Safely Accommodating Travel Demand across the Union Pacific Railroad Tracks</u></b></p> <p><b>Planning Issues/Considerations</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>It is recommended that the circulation plan for CVSP should not add traffic to any at-grade railroad crossings. Palm Avenue should not be widened at its intersection with Monterey Road; but it should remain in its current form (e.g. 2-lane rural roadway serving the existing neighborhood) or if widening is deemed necessary, a grade-separated crossing of the railroad should be constructed in conjunction with an intersection with Monterey Road.</li></ul>
<p><b><u>Enhancing Transit Services within Coyote Valley</u></b></p> <p>There are a number of potential transit service opportunities that should be considered in developing the Coyote Valley Specific Plan. A Caltrain station is already planned in North Coyote Valley as an element of the Coyote Valley Research Park project. This station will primarily serve the needs of workers commuting to jobs within the campus industrial area. The magnitude of housing being planned for the CVSP area is sufficient to support another Caltrain station, perhaps also including a park and ride facility. There is currently VTA bus service on Santa Teresa Boulevard.</p>	<p><b><u>Enhancing Transit Services within Coyote Valley</u></b></p> <p><b>Planning Issues/Considerations</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>Caltrain station locations should be evaluated as part of the planning process. One Coyote Valley Caltrain station location alternative would probably be near the intersection of Coyote Valley Parkway and Monterey Road. A station at this location may be convenient for the future residents, as well as for commuters on Monterey Road and U.S. 101. A station at this location might also become a logical terminus for a possible future light rail line extension, creating a major multimodal transportation transfer center analogous to Tamien or Diridon Station.</li></ul>

## COYOTE VALLEY SPECIFIC PLAN PLANNING CONSIDERATIONS

Based on Technical Reports prepared in 2003, as amended

Page 23 of 29

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>Although VTA does not currently provide local bus service through Coyote Valley on Monterey Road, the development potential along the road and the possibility of connecting to one or more Caltrain stations may provide a significant incentive for new bus service.</li></ul>
<p><b><u>Out-of-Valley Transportation Planning Issues</u></b></p> <p>The development of Coyote Valley will occur within an already heavily developed county, which has many existing traffic capacity problems. The most significant of these issues are:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>Adequacy of U.S. 101 freeway capacity to serve other planned developments (north and south of Coyote Valley),</li><li>Increases in travel demand from the eventual utilization of buildings already constructed in the Silicon Valley region, north of Coyote Valley, but currently unoccupied (as reported in early 2004, approximately 60 million square feet of vacant office and industrial buildings which represent approximately 200,000 jobs or employees), and</li><li>Traffic impacts attributable to the commuting needs for those residents of the CVSP area who would work outside the valley.</li></ul>	<p><b><u>Out-of-Valley Transportation Planning Issues</u></b></p> <p><b>Planning Issues/Considerations</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>The adequacy of U.S. 101 freeway capacity is a significant issue which will be further studied through the specific plan process.</li><li>The City and Santa Clara Valley Transportation Authority (VTA) have identified, and in some cases are proceeding on, operational improvements on US 101 between the I-280/I-680 interchange and the Blossom Hill Road/Silver Creek Valley Road interchange. These improvements primarily consist of modifications to existing interchanges and additional auxillary lanes.</li><li>The Planning process should evaluate methods to reduce out-of-valley traffic impacts including increasing the opportunities for trips to be made <i>within</i> the valley. The large concentration of employment proposed for the CVSP area will help contain many work trips; but, it will also be important to provide a comprehensive mix of land uses in order to help contain other kinds of trips. These will include school, shopping, personal business, and recreational trips.</li></ul>



COYOTE VALLEY SPECIFIC PLAN PLANNING CONSIDERATIONS

Based on Technical Reports prepared in 2003, as amended

Page 24 of 29

<b><i>LAND USE</i></b>	
<b><u>Land Use Compatibility</u></b>	<b><u>Land Use</u></b>
<p><b><i>Hazardous Materials</i></b></p> <p>Existing land uses within the CVSP area are primarily agricultural in nature and include greenhouses/nurseries and orchards. The Hamlet of Coyote includes residential, commercial, and industrial land uses and there is an area of residential uses located between Santa Teresa Boulevard and Monterey Road, north of Palm Avenue. Additionally, there are some commercial and industrial uses located along Monterey Highway. Agricultural and industrial uses can have the potential for hazardous materials contamination due to leaking tanks, spills, or the long-term use of pesticides and fertilizers.</p> <p><b><i>Noise</i></b></p> <p>The mainline Union Pacific Railroad (UPRR) tracks run through Coyote Valley, adjacent and parallel to Monterey Road and constitute a significant noise source with additional operations planned in the future.</p>	<p><b><i>Hazardous Materials</i></b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>Recommendations regarding the remediation of hazardous materials are described under <i>Hazardous Materials</i>.</li></ul> <p><b><i>Noise</i></b></p> <p><b>Planning Issues/Considerations</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>Noise sensitive land uses, including schools, residences, and parks need to be planned with sufficient setbacks from rail and/or sound attenuation measures. Appropriate setbacks should be taken into account during the preparation of the CVSP.</li></ul>
<b><u>Monterey Road and UPRR Tracks</u></b>	<b><u>Monterey Road and the UPRR Tracks</u></b>
<p>Monterey Road and the adjacent UPRR tracks travel through the eastern side of the CVSP area. At-grade crossings of the UPRR tracks would be unsafe and the widening of Monterey Road is constrained by both the UPRR tracks and Coyote Creek (in the northern portion of the CVSP area).</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>These transportation facilities are important planning considerations for the development of the CVSP area. At grade crossings of UPRR tracks should be avoided as described under <i>Transportation</i>.</li></ul>

COYOTE VALLEY SPECIFIC PLAN PLANNING CONSIDERATIONS

Based on Technical Reports prepared in 2003, as amended

Page 25 of 29

<p style="text-align: center;"><b><u>Williamson Act Contracts</u></b></p> <p>There are 14 properties (approximately 230 acres) within the North and Mid-Coyote areas that are under Williamson Act Contracts. All but one of them are on-going, meaning that the property owners have not applied to be released from the contract. Therefore, approximately 220 acres are currently under Williamson Act Contracts within the CVSP area. Approximately 41 additional properties within the Greenbelt are under Williamson Act Contracts.</p> <p>In order to relinquish properties from Williamson Act Contracts, either the nonrenewal process must be initiated or the contract must be cancelled. The existence of an opportunity for another use of the property is not sufficient reason for cancellation. In addition, the uneconomic character of an existing agricultural use shall not, by itself, be a sufficient reason to cancel a contract. The landowner must pay a cancellation fee equal to 12 1/2 percent of the cancellation valuation of the property.</p>	<p style="text-align: center;"><b><u>Williamson Act Contracts</u></b></p> <p><b>Planning Issues/Considerations</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Williamson Act contracts would not be a significant impediment to the planning process. In order to facilitate development of the fourteen (14) properties within the CVSP that are under Williamson Act Contracts, the planning process should address the timing of City initiation of the nonrenewal process.</li><li>• It takes nine years to complete the nonrenewal process, which can be initiated either by the property owner or the local government.</li><li>• Only the landowner can petition to cancel a contract. To approve a tentative contract cancellation, a county or city must make specific findings that are supported by substantial evidence.</li></ul>
<p style="text-align: center;"><b><u>Prime Farmland</u></b></p> <p>The CVSP and Greenbelt areas consists primarily of “Prime Farmland”, as defined by the State of California. Pockets of “Farmland of Statewide Importance” and “Grazing Lands” are also located within the CVSP area.</p>	<p style="text-align: center;"><b><u>Prime Farmland</u></b></p> <p><b>Planning Issues/Considerations</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• The elimination of agricultural uses on prime farmlands within North and Mid Coyote cannot be avoided while developing urban uses.</li></ul> <p><b>Recommendations for further review</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Opportunities for sustainable agriculture uses within the Greenbelt area should be considered and evaluated.</li></ul>

COYOTE VALLEY SPECIFIC PLAN PLANNING CONSIDERATIONS

Based on Technical Reports prepared in 2003, as amended

Page 26 of 29

<p style="text-align: center;"><b><u>Utilities</u></b></p> <p>Underground utilities are located in primarily within Monterey Road, Bailey Avenue, and Santa Teresa Boulevard within the CVSP area. Fiber optic lines are within the UPRR right-of-way. The Cross Valley Pipeline (SCVWD) which transports water from Anderson Reservoir to Calero Reservoir is located within the Valley generally north of Burnett Avenue to Santa Teresa Boulevard to San Bruno Avenue where it will travel along the base of the western foothills, over the Santa Cruz Mountains to the Calero Reservoir.</p>	<p style="text-align: center;"><b><u>Utilities</u></b></p> <p><b>Planning Issues/Considerations</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Water, sanitary sewer, natural gas, and electricity need to be provided to areas of the CVSP not currently served by these utilities. This is not an impediment to the planning process. A “Master Plan” for an “Underground Utilities District” should be prepared as part of the planning process.</li></ul>
<p style="text-align: center;"><b><u>Visual Resources/Open Space</u></b></p> <p>The visual character of Coyote Valley is predominantly one of open space afforded by agricultural uses, the Coyote Creek parkchain and golf course, and the rolling expanses of surrounding hillsides. This visual open space is apparent to travellers along US 101 and Monterey Road, AMTRAK passengers, and to existing Coyote Valley residents.</p>	<p style="text-align: center;"><b><u>Visual Resources/Open Space</u></b></p> <p><b>Planning Issues/Considerations</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Preservation of visual open space, view corridors, and the points of view from the valley floor (below the 15% slope line) is an important consideration for the planning of CVSP.</li></ul>

***INFRASTRUCTURE AND UTILITIES***

**Storm Drainage Facilities**

Existing storm drain system within the CVSP area includes systems within Santa Teresa Boulevard and Bailey Avenue. There are little or no formal drainage systems or facilities within the CVSP area, except for a series of roadside ditches and culverts that convey waters to Fisher and Coyote Creeks.

**Storm Drainage Facilities**

**Planning Issues/Considerations**

- Storm drainage facilities will be required for Monterey Road. In addition, the storm drainage facilities should be designed to conform to the requirements of the NPDES Construction Activity Stormwater Permit administered by the RWQCB, as part of the SCVURPPP.

**Sanitary Sewer and Wastewater Facilities**

Existing public sanitary sewer facilities are located within the North Coyote Valley area. The remainder of the CVSP area relies on private septic tanks. Preliminary studies indicate that the existing pipe in Santa Teresa Boulevard has the carrying capacity for these peak flows. It is anticipated that the development proposed for the CVSP area (50,000 jobs and a minimum of 25,000 dwelling units) would generate peak flows of 12.6 mgd. The average flow would be approximately 9.6 mgd.

Coyote Valley lies approximately 20 miles south of the WPCP where sewage treatment is provided. Current sewage treatment is below the historic maximum flow of 130 mgd that was experienced in 2000-2001. The WPCP is currently operating under an order that limits discharge to the San Francisco Bay to 120 mgd. Wastewater reclamation has been implemented that represents up to 15 mgd. This reclamation serves to reduce the discharge to the Bay, keeping it below the 120 mgd limit.

**Sanitary Sewer and Wastewater Facilities**

**Planning Issues/Considerations**

- The Water Pollution Control Plant (WPCP) has capacity to treat sewage flows from Coyote Valley, however, due to discharge constraints, the reclamation of a substantial fraction (if not all) of the wastewater generated in Coyote Valley should be evaluated as part of the planning process.

**Recommendations for further review**

- Additional modeling should be conducted to determine adequate pipe capacity and condition north of the CVSP area.

## COYOTE VALLEY SPECIFIC PLAN PLANNING CONSIDERATIONS

Based on Technical Reports prepared in 2003, as amended

Page 28 of 29

<p style="text-align: center;"><b><u>Potable Water</u></b></p> <p>Existing water supply lines are located in Bailey and Santa Teresa Boulevard, north of the Urban Services Boundary. Water is provided in this area by both Great Oaks and San Jose Municipal Water Companies. Private water wells are used throughout the CVSP area.</p>	<p style="text-align: center;"><b><u>Potable Water</u></b></p> <p><b>Planning Issues/Considerations</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Additional wells would be required to provide potable water to the CVSP area. This water could be provided from within the Valley; however, this would require water resource management as described in <i>Hydrology</i>. Water tanks for storage will also be needed.</li></ul>
<p style="text-align: center;"><b><u>Recycled Water</u></b></p> <p>See <i>Hydrology</i>, above. City of San Jose is currently constructing an extension of the recycled water pipeline to serve the Santa Teresa and Silver Creek Communities.</p>	<p style="text-align: center;"><b><u>Recycled Water</u></b></p> <p><b>Planning Issues/Considerations</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• A water recycling Master Plan should be developed in conjunction with the preparation of the CVSP.</li></ul>
<p style="text-align: center;"><b><u>Electricity</u></b></p> <p>Existing overhead utility lines and towers provide electricity through the Coyote Valley. Additional supplies and lines will be required for the CVSP area. The construction of the Metcalf Energy Center may allow for the extension of electricity to the Valley.</p>	<p style="text-align: center;"><b><u>Electricity</u></b></p> <p><b>Planning Issues/Considerations</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• PG&amp;E and Calpine should be consulted regarding the extension of electrical power to the CVSP area. Existing lines may require expansion or upgrading to serve the CVSP area. Two or three electrical substations could be required for the development of the CVSP. This should be taken into account during the planning process.</li></ul>

COYOTE VALLEY SPECIFIC PLAN PLANNING CONSIDERATIONS

Based on Technical Reports prepared in 2003, as amended

Page 29 of 29

<p style="text-align: center;"><b><u>Natural Gas</u></b></p> <p>Natural gas service is limited mostly to the North Coyote Valley area with utilities within Santa Teresa Boulevard and Monterey Road. Natural gas lines also run adjacent to US 101.</p>	<p style="text-align: center;"><b><u>Natural Gas</u></b></p> <p><b>Planning Issues/Considerations</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• PG&amp;E should be consulted regarding the extension of natural gas service to the CVSP area. The installation of gas lines throughout the area will be required and future needs will be evaluated during the planning process.</li></ul>
<p style="text-align: center;"><b><u>Communications</u></b></p> <p>Communication services area provided within the CVSP area by SBC Communications (telephone) and Comcast Corporations (cable). Telephone lines are located throughout the CVSP area.</p>	<p style="text-align: center;"><b><u>Communications</u></b></p> <p><b>Planning Issues/Considerations</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Proper planning and formal requests to providers will be required for the extension of communication service to the CVSP area. Future needs should be evaluated during the CVSP planning process.</li></ul>